## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/747,607	DROUET ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
VAN KIM T. NGUYEN	2152	

	VAN KIM T. NGUYEN	2152			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth interthan SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the tend statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second con	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially red	E below); lucing or simplifying th			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 4.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a		
10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.		
<ul> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: argument was not persuasive.

- 1. In response to Applicant's arguments that the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest a "user proxy" and proceeds on by explaining why Ebata does not send back a response message to the claimed "user proxy", see page 5, 2-3, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references, especially in this case whence Ebata is not relied upon for a user proxy since Calo already discloses that limitation (see Calo, col. 3: lines 38-49). See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
- 2. In response to applicant's argument that Li does not disclose the claimed "table", applicant is invited to review Refs. 70, 74, 76/Figs. 9a-c, respectively, where a table is clearly disclosed.